



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/038,770	01/08/2002	Ina B. Widegren	2380-587	7915

7590 09/22/2005

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.
8th Floor
1100 North Glebe Road
Arlington, VA 22201

EXAMINER

PATEL, CHIRAG R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2141

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/038,770	WIDEGREN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chirag R. Patel	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _____ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-18, 20-23, 25-32, 34-38, 40-48, and 50-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rinne (US 6,845,100).

As per claims 1, 12, 28, 29 and 42, Rinne discloses a method for end-to-end resource coordination for a multimedia session including plural media data streams between a first mobile terminal associated with a first local access network and a second mobile terminal associated with a second local access network, where the first and second local networks are coupled to an IP network, (Col 6 lines 21-52) comprising:

the first mobile terminal using a PDP context activation procedure to determine if sufficient resources can be provisioned in the first local access network to support a quality of service (QoS) requested for each of the media data streams in the session, and if so, sending a first QoS confirmation message to the second mobile terminal, and (Col 7 lines 55 – Col 8 line 16)

the second mobile terminal using a PDP context activation procedure to determine if sufficient resources can be provisioned in the second local access network

Art Unit: 2141

to support a quality of service (QoS) requested for each of the media data streams in the session, and if so, sending a second QoS confirmation message to the first mobile terminal. (Col 4 lines 40-45)

As per claims 2 and 31, Rinne discloses the first mobile radio terminal in claim 28, wherein the confirmation message from the first user terminal indicates that the media data streams are allowed to use the IP network via the first local mobile access network to support a quality of service requested for each of the media data streams. (Col 7 lines 55 – Col 8 line 16)

As per claims 3, 18, 32, and 48, Rinne discloses the method in claim 17, wherein a differentiated services provisioning mechanism is used to deliver the requested quality of service for each media data stream in the session across the IP network. (Col 5 lines 1-15)

As per claims 5, 20, 34, and 50, Rinne discloses the method in claim 12, wherein if the requested quality of service for each media data stream in the session can not be provisioned in one of the first and second local access networks, the session is not set up. (Col 11 line 62 – Col 12 line 11)

As per claims 6, 21, 35, and 51, Rinne discloses the method in claim 12, wherein if the requested quality of service for each media data stream in the session can not be

Art Unit: 2141

provisioned in one of the first and second local access networks, setup of the session is attempted with a changed condition. (Col 17 lines 49-65)

As per claim 7, Rinne discloses the method in claim 1, wherein the first user terminal determines whether there are sufficient resources in the first local access network to support a quality of service requested for each of the media data streams in a first direction from the first terminal to the second terminal and in a second direction from the second terminal to the first terminal, and (Col 5 lines 15-25, Col 13 lines 12-21)

wherein the second user determines whether there are sufficient resources in the second local access network to support a quality of service requested for each of the media data streams in a first direction from the first terminal to the second terminal and in a second direction from the second terminal to the first terminal. (Col 5 lines 15-25, Col 13 lines 12-21)

As per claims 8 and 15, Rinne discloses the method in claim 12, further comprising: the second mobile terminal informing the first mobile terminal that the second mobile terminal lacks capabilities to send the second message for one or more of the media streams, and (Col 11 line 62 – Col 12 line 11)

the first mobile terminal informing the second mobile terminal that the first mobile terminal will proceed with the multimedia session without the second mobile terminal sending the second message. (Col 17 lines 60-65)

Art Unit: 2141

As per claims 10 and 40, Rinne discloses the first mobile radio terminal in claim 28, wherein the first and second local access networks are mobile radio access networks and the second user terminal is a mobile terminal. (Col 1 lines 15-36, Col 8 lines 45-65)

As per claims 11, 41, and 43, Rinne discloses the first mobile radio terminal in claim 40, wherein the first and second mobile radio access networks are GPRS or UMTS networks, and wherein the electronic circuitry is configured to assure there are sufficient resources in the first GPRS or UMTS network to support a quality of service requested for each of the media data streams using a PDP context signaling procedure. (Col 7 line 40 – Col 8 line 25)

As per claims 13 and 44, Rinne discloses the method in claim 12, wherein the first and second QoS confirmation messages confirm end-to-end provision of the requested quality of service for each media data stream in the session. (Col 5 lines 15-25)

As per claims 14 and 45, Rinne discloses the method in claim 12, wherein the first and second mobile terminals provision sufficient resources to support a quality of service requested for each direction of each of the media streams. (Col 13 lines 12-21)

Art Unit: 2141

As per claim 16, Rinne discloses the method in claim 12, wherein the first and second local access networks are GPRS or UMTS networks. (Col 8 lines 25-35)

As per claims 17 and 47, Rinne discloses the method in claim 12, wherein the IP network supports the requested quality of service for each media data stream in the session. (Col 17 lines 13-48)

As per claim 22, Rinne discloses the method in claim 21, wherein the changed condition may be applied to one or more media streams in the second local access network. (Col 17 lines 49-65)

As per claims 23 and 52, Rinne disclose the method in claim 21, wherein the changed condition is a reduced quality of service for one or more of the media data streams. (Col 17 lines 49-65)

As per claims 25, 38, 46, and 54, Rinne discloses the method in claim 12, wherein if the requested quality of service for each media data stream in the session can not be provisioned in one of the first and second local access networks, the first mobile terminal informs the second mobile terminal that the second mobile terminal need not determine if sufficient resources can be provisioned in the second local access network, and the first and second mobile terminal complete the multimedia session

Art Unit: 2141

setup without using QoS confirmation messages for the one or more media streams.

(Col 14 lines 31-50)

As per claims 26 and 55, Rinne discloses the method in claim 12, wherein if the requested quality of service for each media data stream in the session can not be provisioned in one of the first and second local access networks, the first mobile terminal does not determine if sufficient resources can be provisioned in the first local access network and informs the second mobile terminal that the second mobile terminal not to determine if sufficient resources can be provisioned in the second local access network. (Col 14 lines 31-50)

As per claims 27 and 53, Rinne discloses the method in claim 12, wherein if the requested quality of service for each media data stream in the session can not be provisioned in one of the first and second local access networks, the first and second mobile terminal complete the multimedia session setup without using QoS confirmation messages for the one or more media streams. (Col 14 lines 31-50)

As per claim 30, Rinne discloses the first mobile radio terminal in claim 29, wherein the confirmation message detected from the second user terminal indicates that the media data streams are allowed to use the IP network via the second local mobile access network to support a quality of service requested for each of the media data streams. (Col 7 lines 55 – Col 8 line 16)

As per claim 36, Rinne discloses the first mobile radio terminal in claim 28, wherein the electronic circuitry is configured to assure there are sufficient resources in the first local access network to support a quality of service requested for each of the media data streams in a first direction from the first terminal to the second terminal and in a second direction from the second terminal to the first terminal. (Col 12 lines 25-35)

As per claim 37, Rinne discloses the first mobile radio terminal in claim 28, wherein the electronic circuitry is configured to detect a message from the second mobile terminal indicating that there are insufficient resources in the second local access network to support a quality of service requested for each of the media data streams. (Col 17 lines 60-65)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 19, 33, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rinne (US 6,845,100) in view of Dharanikota (US 6,914,883).

Art Unit: 2141

As per claims 4, 19, 33, and 49, Rinne discloses the method in claim 12. Rinne fails to disclose media data in the session is assured without using a resource-reservation protocol (RSVP). Dharantikota discloses wherein requested quality of service for each media data stream in the session is assured without using a resource-reservation protocol (RSVP). (Col 4 lines 45-60) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art disclose session without using a resource-reservation protocol (RSVP) in the disclosure of Rinne. The motivation for doing so would have been to minimize the amount of signaling required on the IP QOS architecture. (Col 2 lines 1-13)

Claims 9, 24, 39, and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rinne (US 6,845,100) in view of Stacey et al. –hereinafter Stacey – (US 6,765,921).

As per claims 9, 24, 39, and 56, Rinne discloses the method in claim 12. Rinne fails to disclose session initiation protocol (SIP) signaling. Stacey discloses wherein the first and second messages are communicated using session initiation protocol (SIP) signaling. (Col 5 line 39 – Col 6 line 57) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to disclose session initiation protocol (SIP) signaling in the disclosure of Rinne. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to tunnel content control information. (Col 5 line 39 – Col 6 line 57)

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. These references are disclosed in the Notices of References cited page and teach numerous methods and apparatus for coordinating end-to-end quality of service requirements for media flows in a multimedia session. A close review of these references is recommended.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chirag R. Patel whose telephone number is (571)272-7966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:30AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia, can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pairedirect.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private


Application/Control Number: 10/038,770

Page 11

Art Unit: 2141

PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197

(toll free).



RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER